



Docket No.: Y1929.0085

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Shinichi Morimoto

Application No.: 09/963,261

Confirmation No.: 8415

Filed: September 26, 2001

Art Unit: 2134

For: LAN that allows non-authenticated external
terminal station to access a predetermined
device in LAN

Examiner: M. J. Simitoski

DECLARATION OF IAN R. BLUM

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

I, Ian R. Blum, declare as follows:

1. I am currently an associate in the law firm Dickstein Shapiro, LLP
("Dickstein").

2. I am registered to practice before the United States Patent and
Trademark Office (USPTO) (Reg. No. 42,336).

3. I represent Shinichi Morimoto, the inventor, in connection with
prosecution of the above-captioned patent application before the USPTO.

4. Neither I nor anyone else at Dickstein received a Notice of Allowance
and Issue Fee Due, mailed October 2, 2007. In her April 10, 2008 Declaration
(submitted herewith), Dickstein docketing specialist Henrietta Marron, whose

responsibility it was to open, record, and docket mail received from the USPTO, stated that, as of October 2, 2007, no substantive paper was received from the USPTO for the above-captioned patent application. Subsequently, the only paper received was a Notice of Abandonment, mailed on February 29, 2008.

5. A search of the file jacket for the above-captioned patent application indicates that the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due was not received. Specifically, a search of the file jacket did not result in the location or discovery of the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due, mailed October 2, 2007.

6. If anyone employed by Dickstein had received the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due mailed October 2, 2007, that Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due would have been entered into Dickstein's docket records. Specifically, a response to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due would have been docketed with a three month deadline for January 2, 2008.

7. A copy of Dickstein's docket records for January 2, 2008 (labeled "January 2008") is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

8. Dickstein's docket records (Exhibit A) have been redacted to protect client confidentiality. For all records, the redacted portions are the client names.

9. In all cases, sufficient information has been left un-redacted to distinguish the above-captioned patent application from the patent applications with due dates docketed for January 2, 2008.

10. No redacted docket number corresponds to the docket number of the above-captioned patent application (Y1929.0085).


11. The fact that no redacted docket number on Dickstein's docket records corresponds to the docket number of the above-captioned patent application indicates that the law firm did not receive the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due.

12. The fact that the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due does not appear in the Dickstein docket indicates that it was never received by Dickstein.

I am aware that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 and may jeopardize the validity of the instant application or any patent issuing thereon. I certify that all statements made of my own knowledge are true and all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true.

Dated: April 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ian R. Blum', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial 'I'.